The Delusions of Counter-Force

By Sanford Gottlieb: A Nation-Wide Survey of the Many Peace Candidates Now In The Field, Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 25 JUNE 25, 1962 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

A Triumph of Herman Kahnism

The best, perhaps the only way to make the nuclear deterrent really credible is to convince your opponent that you're a little touched in the head. When I was a boy there was a comic strip about the Terrible Tempered Mr. Bangs; he had to be handled with kid gloves because he would blow up on the slightest provocation. Those who want seriously to play the game of nuclear diplomacy, a politer word than blackmail, should model themselves on this instructive character. A high component of irrascible irrationality is required to make your opponent believe you'd blow your brains out, and the world with it, rather than let the Ministry of Fine Arts go to a neutralist in Lower Slobbovia. From this standpoint an oddly stabilizing role has been played by all those 3 and 4 star windbags who have made the Pentagon seem America's largest rest home for the emotionally disturbed; they've probably done more than the Strategic Air Command to make Moscow and Peking nervous. The fear that our military establishment really is wacky enough some day to press that button *is* a deterrent. It is to this salutary skepticism about the Pentagon's sanity that Secretary McNamara made a formidable contribution by his speech at Ann Arbor June 16.

Overlooked in The New McNamara Speech

Except for one newspaper, the *Washington Star*, the press has failed at home and abroad to grasp the big news in that McNamara speech. It was the first announcement that the Kennedy Administration had adopted the so-called Counter Force strategy long advocated by the Air Force. Mr. McNamara is not a windy Admiral. He is a highly intellectual fellow. He has a mind like an IBM computer. Perhaps that's what made him fall for this nostrum with which the Air Force has been working its way through the War College for many months. On the computers, Counter Force plays a lovely tune. We build up a force so overwhelming we can pinpoint the enemy's missile and air bases, wiping them out in one counter-force swoop while the enemy dare not retaliate against our cities because *then* with our reserve forces we'd wipe out his. The Pentagon strategists and the Rand Corporation military intellectuals have been waging war like mad on the computers for months; Khrushchev must shudder to think how often these IBM Napoleons have devastated Minsk. This Counter Force, so the Air Force computers say, makes thermonuclear war rational, and *winnable* and leave us at the end with our cities intact. This is how the Pentagon has come to the conclusion voiced by Mr. McNamara at Ann Arbor that "basic military strategy in a possible general nuclear war should be approached in much the same way that more conventional military operations have been regarded in the past. That is to say, principal military objectives, in the event of a nuclear war stemming from a major attack on the Alliance, should be the destruction of the enemy's military forces, not of his civilian population."

This is the victory of Kahn and Kissinger and the other Pied Pipers of limited themonuclear war. This is what Mr. McNamara means by "a strategy of controlled response." This is what came out of that Rockefeller Brothers Fund study some years ago which launched the idea of limited war in the thermonuclear age, a delusion tailor-made for the needs of far-flung business enterprise: How to Push the Russians out of the Middle East Without Setting Fire to Standard Oil's Wells. This is the Air Force nostrum put on public sale in that *Washington Star* series by its Pentagon reporter, Richard Fryklund, two winters ago and since developed in all its vapid silliness in his book, "100 Million Lives: Maximum Survival in A Nuclear War." This is the "Spare the Cities" strategy to which Mr. McNamara referred when he said "we are giving a possible opponent the strongest imaginable incentive to refrain from striking our own cities." The war would be won on points, like a tennis match and end as Mr. Fryklund pictures it in his book: "Both sides could just quit, snarl at each other and start rebuilding," presumably, that is, for a return match.

(Continued on Page Two)

All We Got to Do Is Make Sure The Russians Use the Same Computers We Do

General BURCHINALL [Director of Plans HQ US Air Force]: In summary . . . we have enunciated a military strategy, optimized for its deterrent value, with provision for prevailing, should deterrence fail, and with a most important objective of preventing by all means militarily possible damage to our strengths and casualties among our people. The strategy has been tested [that is, on the computers—IFS] and is feasible. . . . The point I am making here, sir, is that we deter a Soviet attack if we, in fact, can create this kind of an imbalance in our favor after he has started a war. That if he can calculate this—and Malinovsky says they are using computers [deleted by censor]—he will never start a war. . . .

Chairman RUSSELL: General, do you think you can fight a nuclear war, using large-yield warheads, and confine the attack just to military targets?

[Deleted by censor].

Chairman RUSSELL: I never have been impressed by these people who write these great books giving all these alternatives of fighting.

—Military Procurement 1963: Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, Jan.-Feb. 1962, pps. 550-3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Counter Force Means An Endless Arms Race and A Garrison State

(Continued from Page One)

Thus the Air Force could stay in business forever, and war continue as the main sport of mankind.

Patent Medicine for A NATO Headache

Why did Mr. McNamara unveil this nonsense in a speech which was designed to appeal over de Gaulle's head to France and Western Europe against the idea of an independent nuclear deterrent? Because just as Russia fears we may be crazy enough to press that button, Western Europe is haunted by fear that we really aren't; it saw Mr. Dulles, the advocate of liberation, not only hold back when the East Germans rose in 1953 and the Hungarians in 1956 but hasten to assure Moscow we would not intervene. It fears we might similarly hesitate to commit suicide for the sake of West Berlin. That is why the French and behind them the Germans are pressing for a deterrent of their own. To make this seem unnecessary, Mr. McNamara is trying to tell them that we have a wonderful new plan by which we could smash Russia's war power and still survive if Moscow threatened a vital Western interest. We wouldn't have to commit suicide, nor would Europe. Our bombers and ICBM's would destroy Russia's in a twinkling; all the city dwellers of Western Europe and America would have to fear is fallout and for that two weeks underground on the Pentagon's new protein wafers would suffice. Counter-Force is the patent medicine to end NATO's biggest headache.

We hope public opinion at home and abroad will wake up to the side effects. Counter-Force means an unlimited arms race, in which each side must strive to stay so far ahead that it can wipe out the other's forces in one first strike. It puts a higher premium than before on secrecy, to keep those bases from being spotted by the enemy. It invites extension of the race into outer space, in which new commanding vantage points may be established. The best discussion of its consequences I have seen is the brilliant little book of Arthur Waskow's "The Limits of Defense" (Doubleday) which I recommend highly for those who want to understand the mysteries of "stabilized deterrent" and "counter force." The latter would increase the temptation to strike first. "Every major international crisis," as Mr. Waskow writes, "would press both sides quickly to the brink of war, and if counter-force strategy had been highly developed, beyond the brink." This is a recipe for hair-trigger tension. The domestic consequences were soberly spelled out by George A. Lowe in the leading article of the April issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings. They are "unlimited numbers of hardened fixed-base missiles, greatly accelerated arms race in space, enormous civil defense . . . tremendous governmental regimentation." This shapes military doctrine and national destiny to the hungry needs of the aviation and uranium industries.

Except for a few vague and heavily censored references in recent hearings of which we give samples on these two pages, this move toward counter-force with all its fateful implications has been brought about without discussion in public or Congress. Only a small stratum of intellectuals, some working for, others against, the military machine, are aware of the controversy, even understand its terminology. Here we see dramatically displayed the erosion of free and representative government, its abdication to an elite and their computers.

What if the Russians refuse to play the game? What if they stick to a second strike retaliatory threat against our people and cities? What if they move on from 100-megaton weapons to 1,000-MT monsters? Twenty of the latter detonated high up and dirty would do us in. This would be the natural strategy for a power which is ahead of us in heavy weight rocketry but behind in resources. It is time the American public realized where it is being led and took a good look at this weird delusion that in the age of themonuclear weapons you can pinpoint hidden bases while leaving cities and people unscathed. It has been said that the world would be in danger if the H-bomb ever fell into irrational hands. Will we wake up one of these days to find that it has—and that the hands are ours?

How We Estimate Soviet Missiles

Chairman RUSSELL (D. Ga.): I notice your estimate of the intercontinental missiles the Soviets have on launching sites is [deleted by censor]. . . . How do you get at the composite; do you add up what you [the Air Force] put and what the Army puts and what the Navy estimates and the CIA, and divide it by 4? Just how do you get at it?

General SMITH [Vice-Chief of Staff, Air Force]: No, sir. That is not so. May I ask General Breitweiser [Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Air Force] to give you the way the estimate is arrived at.

General BREITWEISER: All of the agencies, of course, Mr. Chairman, work from the same body of evidence [deleted by censor]. . . .

RUSSELL: Who makes the final determination of what the Secretary of Defense brings us or what the President is furnished about the number of missiles on launchers?

BREITWEISER: The national intelligence estimates with which you are familiar, Mr. Chairman, contain [deleted].

RUSSELL: I see. Thank you, sir. I understand it a little better. I have been concerned about that. In the last analysis then the President just takes his choice of which one he thinks is most credible.

—Military Procurement 1963: Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, Jan.-Feb. 1962, pps. 519-20.

Russell of Georgia Attacks the Delusion Nuclear Wars Can Be Fought Like Tournaments

"There have been some estimates and some so-called mathematical computations of the casualties that would result from a nuclear war under various assumptions, including a positive attempt by the adversaries to limit targeting to military installations and facilities. . . . To me these extrapolations . . . are exceedingly unrealistic. They presuppose a war being waged with rational restraint by both sides. I doubt that there could be anything rational in the awful eventuality of a nuclear attack. . . .

"The day of the tournament has long since passed into history. I am convinced that we would be deluding ourselves if we were to base any national policy on the assumption that any potential adversary would be restrained and rational and abide by any such rules. In my opinion, if nuclear war begins, it will be a war of extermination."

—Russell (D. Ga.) to the Senate April 11.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Country-Wide Survey of the Many Peace Candidates Now in The Field

By Sanford Gottlieb

Peace, which has been elusive both as a condition of human existence and as an issue in American politics, is making a modest comeback in pre-November electioneering. New England abounds in "peace candidates," running primarily for the educational value of airing the issue in the political arena. Others are running in Baltimore, Detroit, Ithaca and central Illinois. They have entered races as Democrats, Republicans and independents. Moreover, their effort is complemented by the campaigns of a vigorous group of Democrats, concentrated largely in California, who are running not to educate but to win.

In the latter category the situation in the redistricted 29th Congressional District of Los Angeles promises the earliest rewards. There, State Assemblyman George Brown has won the Democratic primary in the face of opposition by Rep. Chet Holifield and the party regulars. *The Liberal Democrat,* an independent journal close to the Democratic club movement in California, claims that Holifield put another candidate named Brown in the primary race in order to reduce the Assemblyman's chances. Some of the labor unions backing Brown were subjected to intense pressure by the Democratic organization in an effort to make them shift their endorsement. Nevertheless, with an excellent liberal voting record, Brown held his labor support. He also attracted the peace groups into a new and effective coalition with the unions and the club movement.

SANE Takes A Hand

Brown, City Councilman Edward Roybal and attorney Jerry Pacht, running respectively in the Democratic primaries of the 29th, 30th and 31st C. D.'s, campaigned vigorously in favor of disarmament, an end to nuclear tests, and realistic planning for conversion to a peacetime economy. SANE and Women Strike for Peace succeeded in directing 350 of their local members into the three campaigns as volunteer workers, displaying an ability to "deliver" which is without precedent for peace groups. Both Brown and Roybal survived the primaries.

Brown will face one of the three avowed members of the John Birch Society running on the Republican ticket in California. The issues could not be more clearly drawn. The district has a Democratic majority, and, barring an unforeseen upheaval, Brown should be elected in November. Roybal faces a tougher fight against incumbent Rep. Gordon McDonough. In the Bay Area, two more Democrats espousing a strong peace platform have won the primary and face Republican incumbents. They are John O'Connell of San Francisco and Charles Weidner of Contra Costa County.

Among the peace candidates who are campaigning mainly to educate the voters, the best known is H. Stuart Hughes, professor of history at Harvard and author of six books. Eminently qualified to compete in the "Battle of the Dynasties" in Massachusetts by virtue of his kinship to the late Chief Justice Hughes, Stuart Hughes is seeking 72,514 signatures on a statewide petition by July 24 in order to qualify as an independent candidate for the Senate. His campaign began in May with hundreds of volunteers, many of them young housewives, collecting the signatures in a door-to-door canvass. Disinterested observers and even some of Ted Kennedy's aides admit that Hughes is off to a good start. If the President's younger brother wins the Democratic primary, a result by no means assured because of growing resentment against dynastic pressures, Hughes may well find himself in a position to swing a close election to the Republican candidate.

Like his fellow New England peace candidates, Hughes is backed by Political Action for Peace (PAX), which was established this year in order to encourage election campaigns based on the need for disarmament and stronger international institutions. The PAX candidates are united in their support for a policy of unilateral initiatives, a sustained series of acts by the United States designed to produce favorable reciprocation by the Russians.

In 1960, only William Hefner of Greenfield, Mass., campaigned for Congress as a peace candidate. Although he placed third in a field of three in the Democratic primary, he proved his point: that an election campaign can generate more discussion of and publicity about disarmament than the activities of a local peace organization. This year Hefner will run again. He will be joined in the neighboring Third District of Massachusetts by Elizabeth Boardman, a mother of six and co-founder of Voice of Women—New England. In New Hampshire, still another PAX candidate will campaign jointly with her husband, who operates a Quaker school. Helen Bliss, a Democrat, will oppose incumbent Rep. Perkins Bass.

Other individuals have set out on their own as peace candidates. Harrop Freeman, professor of law at Cornell, will run as an independent in the Ithaca area. In Baltimore, Mrs. Caroline Ramsey has already won the Republican primary in the district represented by Congressman Samuel Friedel. In Detroit, Mrs. Elizabeth Weideman will challenge Rep. John Lesinski in the Democratic primary. In central Illinois, Bob Wilson, a Quaker farmer who owns five country weeklies, is the Democratic candidate in the 22nd District. Wilson is linked to Jerome Ziegler, a young Democrat running in the Chicago suburbs with the backing of the party regulars, through the organization Voters for Peace. Another Quaker farmer with the unlikely name of Herbert Hoover ran unsuccessfully against Senator Hickenlooper in Iowa.

The greatest value to flow from this burgeoning interest in peace candidates may be the experience in practical politics which it provides for several thousand members of peace groups. Increasingly determined to change the political climate through the ballot box, the peace movement is developing its cadres in 1962 for what could be a major effort in 1964.

Key Congressional Fights

Foreign policy issues loom large in the efforts of Frank Kowalski and William Meyer to win Senate seats in Connecticut and Vermont, and in the campaigns of Congressman Robert Kastenmeier (Wis.) and William Fitts Ryan (N. Y.). Kowalski is challenging John Bailey's machine and its candidate, HEW Secretary Abraham Ribicoff. Kowalski needs 200 delegates at the Democratic convention in July in order to force a primary election. He claims 230. Meyer was the Capitol's firmest voice for peace during his single term (1958-60). Opposing popular Senator George Aiken in a heavily Republican state, Meyer describes himself as a Democrat who takes an independent view of domestic and world issues. Kastenmeier has been made a target of the GOP because of his role in producing The Liberal Papers. **Because of redistricting, Ryan faces a rugged primary fight.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In and Around the Capitol: The Country's Growth Rate May Be Slow, But Not the CIA's

One Kind of Filibuster Against Which the Democratic Leadership Fights Hard

MORE MILITANT ABOUT A.T.&T. THAN CIVIL RIGHTS: When the Southerners earlier this session filibustered against new civil rights legislation, the Democratic leadership held the Senate to a sedate 8-hour day and 5-day week. But now that a group led by Kefauver and Long of Louisiana are out to talk the Satellite Communications Bill to death, Majority Leader Mansfield orders 10-hour day and six-day weeks. . . . SEVENTH CONTEMPT REVERSAL: In a per curiam opinion with Harlan and Clark dissenting the Supreme Court last Monday reversed the conviction of Frank Grumman, an American Communications Association official, for contempt of the Un-American Activities Committee on the ground that the indictment was faulty. This was the 7th witch hunt contempt reversal this term. . . .

Still Hope on the Drug Bill

IF ONLY elderly people were as well organized to fight for cheaper and safer drugs as they are to fight for medical care, the drug lobby could still be defeated at this session. While the Kefauver bill is being emasculated in the Senate Judiciary Committee, hearings have begun on companion bills in the House. It would be better to block meaningless compromises this session and fight for a meaningful bill next year than to let the Administration and the drug lobby get away with a phony measure which could be labelled as reform and lull the public back to sleep for another few years. The *New York Times* which we criticized last week for failing to report the Kefauver speech accusing the Administration of conniving with Eastland for a feeble compromise, made amends with a strong editorial (June 15) supporting the original Kefauver bill and asking the President to make clear whether he still favors that or the current weak substitute. . . .

FOR FREEDOM RIDERS: Congressman Wm. Fitts Ryan (*D. N.Y.*) introduced a bill last Tuesday providing that no person may be denied "any license, right, benefit or privilege" or be barred from government employment because he had taken part in any peaceful demonstration for equal rights or against discrimination. . . . DISARMAMENT THE ONLY CIVIL DEFENSE: This was the theme of a speech made in the Senate last Monday by Young (D. Ohio) welcoming the news that the House appropriations subcommittee under Rep. Albert Thomas of Texas had eliminated the $460 million asked by the Defense Dept. to start a fallout shelter program. . . . RECIPE FOR TROUBLE: A *Los Angeles Times* dispatch from Stuttgart (Wash. Post, June 11) says the Army is intensifying the training of guerrillas for service behind the Iron Curtain in the event of war in Europe. . . .

NO GROWTH RATE PROBLEM WITH CIA: Although the paint is hardly dry on its new $46,000,000 headquarters in McLean, Va., the CIA is already negotiating to rent an additional huge office building at the Naval Weapons Plant in Washington. A 6-story warehouse there is being remodelled into an office building for CIA occupancy. . . . ANTI-CASTRO CUBANS AND THE U.S. ARMY: A year ago the Army opened its ranks to Cuban nationals, expecting about 1,000 veterans of the April, 1961, invasion to join up. Now a UPI dispatch from Fort Jackson, S.C., June 16 discloses that only 17 signed up and eight of these want out. . . . RIP VAN WINKLE DEPT.: When Smathers of Florida finished his speech last Monday calling for establishment of a Cuban government-in-exile, Scott (R. Pa.) rose to support him and added the suggestion that we withdraw diplomatic recognition from Castro!

Watson-Watt on the Van Allen Belt

"It is, as I see it, of the essence of this [scientific] integrity that each step forward should be restrained by a determination not to release forces or processes beyond the control of the investigator. The physics of the ionosphere was studied by methods which did not transgress this salutary restraint. It would be a breach of our implicit Hippocratic oath in physical science to launch a heavy-handed attack on the Van Allen belt by methods whose consequences are beyond reasonable forecast and which might prove irreversible. . . . Even in physics it is undesirable that technological fools should rush in where scientific angels fear to fly. Even the relatively minor trespass of metallic needles in the ionosphere is a breach of this tactical ethical responsibility of science."

—Sir Robert Watson-Watt, FRS, discoverer of radar, at the First National Conference of the Congress of Scientists on Survival, New York City, June 16.

Glad to Send Free Sample Copies to Friends, If You Supply the Stamped Envelopes and Specify Which Issue

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

6/25/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED